

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCILCABINET  
(SPECIAL MEETING)4<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2014Present:

Councillor Lynden Stowe	- Chairman
Councillor NJW Parsons	- Vice-Chairman

## Councillors -

Sue Coakley	Mrs. SL Jepson
C Hancock	Mrs. CH Topple

Observers:

Julian Beale (until 4.45 p.m.)	PR Hodgkinson (invited to speak on Minutes CAB.73, CAB.75 and CAB.76)
Clive Bennett (until 4.15 p.m.)	Sir Edward Horsfall (until 5.10 p.m.)
JGK Birch (until 5.25 p.m.; invited to speak on Minute CAB.73)	RL Hughes (invited to speak on Minute CAB.73)
DC Broad (until 6.05 p.m.)	Mrs. Sheila Jeffery
Mrs. VB Crosbie Dawson (until 5.00 p.m.)	Ms JM Layton (invited to speak on Minutes CAB.73 and CAB.76)
BS Dare (until 5.15 p.m.; invited to speak on Minute CAB.73)	AJ Lichnowski
RW Dutton	DJ Nash (invited to speak on Minutes CAB.73 and CAB.75)
David Fowles (until 5.20 p.m.; invited to speak on Minute CAB.73)	Mrs. MS Rickman (invited to speak on Minute CAB.73)
BD Gibbs (until 4.45 p.m.)	
JA Harris (until 6.10 p.m.; invited to speak on Minute CAB.73)	

CAB.72 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Sue Coakley declared an interest in the Local Plan Reg. 18 Consultation in relation to proposed development site L\_18B (Minute CAB.73(ix) referred), because she was a friend of the owner of that site.

Councillor C Hancock declared an interest in the Local Plan Reg. 18 Consultation in relation to proposed development sites at Northleach (Minute CAB.73(xii) referred), because he was acquainted with some of the owners, an occupier and some householders on some of those sites, and he left the Meeting while that item was being discussed.

Councillor Lynden Stowe declared Disclosable Pecuniary Interests in the Local Plan Reg. 18 Consultation in relation to proposed development sites at Andoversford (Minute CAB.73(ii) referred), because a close member of his family owned land in the vicinity of one of the sites; and Willersey (Minute CAB.73(xvii) referred), because he owned a property in close proximity to one of the sites, and he left the Meeting while those items were being discussed.

Councillor Lynden Stowe declared an interest in Agenda Item (5), because he was also a Member of Gloucestershire County Council.

There were no declarations of interest under Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

There were no declarations of interest under the Code of Conduct for Officers.

CAB.73 LOCAL PLAN REG. 18 CONSULTATION: DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AND SITE ALLOCATIONS

The Leader of the Council introduced the Members of the Cabinet and Officers, and thanked staff in the Forward Planning team for their input into the preparation of the various documents.

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning introduced this item, and reminded the Cabinet that it was being requested to approve the draft document for consultation. The Deputy Leader explained that formal consultation would commence on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> January 2015 for six weeks but that, as the document was already in the public domain, there would effectively be a twelve-week consultation period. The Deputy Leader reminded the members of the public present of the ways in which comments could be submitted, and pointed out that the most efficient way was to submit comments on-line.

The Deputy Leader reminded the Cabinet of the background to the preparation of the draft document, including the scope of the evidence papers; the requirement to produce sound evidence for examination by the Inspector; the need for the Council to prepare a strategy that accommodated its housing requirement for the twenty-year life of the Local Plan; the need for a significant, strategic site to be developed; the identification of such a site at Chesterton, Cirencester; and the Petition relating to the strategic site, which had been presented to the Council at its Meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2014, drawing attention to a summary of that Petition, which had been included at pages 8 and 9 of the circulated report, and the responses to that Petition. The Deputy Leader explained that, despite local opinion and opposition, insufficient evidence had been submitted to convince the Council to change the Development Strategy and that the need for a strategic development site had remained, as identified. The Deputy Leader concluded by reminding the Cabinet that, although Cirencester was the largest town in the District, if the draft Local Plan was approved, it would be the fourth town in order of increase.

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that Neighbourhood Plans, where produced, and the Local Plan would together form the Development Plan for specific settlements, once approved; it was unlikely there would be conflict between the two as any sites identified for development in Neighbourhood Plans would need to go through a similar, rigorous process to the Local Plan; and it was likely that the Council would support additional sites suggested through the Neighbourhood Plan process unless there were exceptional reasons not to do so.

The Leader then invited those Members who had given prior notice that they wished to speak, to address the Cabinet, making general comments on the suggested policies.

Councillor DJ Nash stated that the number of settlements 'welcoming development or any other settlement' had become seventeen recognised settlements during the period since December 2010. Councillor Nash expressed his view that consideration should be given to small settlements where some development could take place. He contended that some small settlements might welcome some development, and concluded by suggesting that development pressure on Cirencester could be reduced if this could be allowed.

In response, the Deputy Leader explained that the issue raised by Councillor Nash would be addressed in the Rural Settlement paper and suggested that Councillor Nash should submit his comment through the on-line portal. The Deputy Leader reminded the Cabinet that the Council could only include 'deliverable' settlements in the Local Plan.

Councillor PR Hodgkinson referred to the current Local Plan, which had expired in 2011. He stated that it had taken four years to prepare a replacement draft Local Plan, which he considered to be a disappointing situation, and a case of 'too little, too late'. Councillor Hodgkinson referred to the number of unplanned houses which, he contended, had been built haphazardly across the District since 2011 and reminded the Cabinet of the total requirement for the District over the life of the proposed Plan, including the strategic development site proposed at Chesterton. Councillor Hodgkinson further contended that such a development would be tantamount to a new town on a green field site, despite public objections and he expressed the view that the Cabinet had not listened to what local people wanted. He expressed concern at the impact such a development would have on the town and reiterated his view that development should be shared out across the District. He suggested that, due to a lack of justification, the burden of development would fall on Cirencester despite the Council having no strategy to encourage new employment to the area. He considered the draft document to represent a 'done deal' and challenged the Cabinet to prove that it listened to local people. Councillor Hodgkinson suggested that the Chesterton development would be of great financial benefit to a landowner who supported the Conservative Party and concluded by stating that the Chesterton development should be reconsidered.

In response, the Deputy Leader stated his gratitude to the staff in the Forward Planning team for their previous responses to the issue of 'rural housing' and reminded the Cabinet that appropriate developments in villages, which accorded with the principle of sustainable development, would be welcome.

Councillor JA Harris considered a six-week consultation period to be 'shocking' and contended that Swindon Borough Council had allowed a ten-week period for consultation. He suggested that members of the public did not understand planning jargon and that the Council was not making enough use of social media to publicise the draft document. He stated that not everyone had access to computer facilities to enable them to submit comments on-line, as suggested by the Deputy Leader, and that the proposed consultation methods were inconvenient which, in his opinion had been reflected in public opinion of the Council. Councillor Harris also expressed the view that the Council was taking the easy option by 'dumping' the proposed strategic development on Cirencester and was ignoring public opinion in relation to rural housing. He believed that a number of rural communities wanted some housing but that those communities were being ignored. He did not consider this to be acceptable, stated his view that responses to the proposed consultation would

probably be ignored, and concluded by commenting that there had been a lack of imagination in the Cabinet over the past three years.

In response, the Deputy Leader reminded the Cabinet that, as the draft documents were already in the public domain, there would in effect be a twelve-week consultation period.

Councillor David Fowles stated that Down Ampney had been included on the list of settlements where development might be appropriate. He accepted the evidence paper for rural housing, but stated that Down Ampney would have to be addressed with sensitivity and asked how it met the objectives as defined in the draft document. He further stated that he would encourage 'sensitive' development in certain villages, but considered Down Ampney to have different criteria, and concluded by suggesting that it should have been included in the Rural Settlement paper.

In response, it was reported that, while Down Ampney was the smallest of the seventeen identified settlements, it was not the smallest in the District and had only four fewer houses than Andoversford, which had also been included in the Strategy. An argument was being put forward that too much development was being proposed in Cirencester and that more should be directed to smaller settlements yet, at the same time, it was being argued here that a smaller settlement did not want much, if any, development. Officers had considered sustainability in their assessment of the suitability of settlements, and had produced a strategy that accorded with national criteria, and Down Ampney was considered to fit those criteria. It was suggested that Down Ampney was not unique in finding that accommodating further development a challenge, yet such development could be beneficial in terms of maintaining facilities etc.

Councillor Ms JM Layton suggested that the Council should be liaising across its borders with neighbouring authorities. Councillor Ms Layton contended that, while the Council shared some services with neighbouring authorities, it did not share planning issues, citing two recent planning applications where Members had been able to view developments outside the District but could not take account of such developments in their subsequent determination of those applications. Councillor Ms Layton also expressed concern that the proposed Gypsy and traveller sites were clustered around the boundary of the District, but no account was taken of what happened in other Council areas. Councillor Ms Layton concluded by suggesting that taking such account could help to avoid high density 'patches' on the District boundary.

In response, the Deputy Leader explained that cross-border co-operation was an on-going part of the Local Plan process. The Deputy Leader also explained that the starting point for determining where Gypsy and traveller sites could be located was to invite landowners to suggest potential sites. The Cabinet was reminded that, while the Council was required to determine planning applications on their individual merits, co-operation in respect of the Local Plan had taken place with other Gloucestershire District Councils, and surrounding authorities. It was reported that the Council was required to submit evidence that such co-operation had taken place.

The Leader explained that the Cabinet would now consider each of the seventeen settlements identified in Appendix 'A' to the circulated report in turn, and he invited the relevant Ward Members to address the Cabinet at the appropriate juncture.

(i) Cirencester

The Deputy Leader explained that statements for each of the settlements would be drawn up prior to the start of the formal consultation period. The Deputy Leader reminded the Cabinet that the purpose was to consider endorsing the proposed sites for consultation. It was pointed out that the words 'proposed employment allocation' on page 30 of Appendix 'A' to the circulated report should be deleted and substituted by the words 'proposed mixed use/other'.

Councillor DJ Nash stated that the small sites identified for development in Cirencester had not caused anxiety to residents. However, he contended that the Chesterton proposal had as he had received approximately 1,000 expressions of opinion through various channels which equated to almost half of the electorate in the Chesterton Ward. Councillor Nash also referred to the number of meetings and consultation events he had attended in relation to the proposed development which, he stated, would affect the whole of Cirencester. Councillor Nash acknowledged that a small minority of residents supported the proposals but reiterated that a majority of residents were against it to some extent. Councillor Nash accepted that there was a need for a strategic development but contended that the development, as proposed, was too large and that he was trying to represent the views of his constituents. Councillor Nash stated that there was a considerable body of opinion that believed the proposed development would be too much for Chesterton and for Cirencester and urged that the proposals be reconsidered to enable 'windfall' and other small developments to take place across the District in order to minimise the impact on Chesterton and Cirencester.

Councillor Nash reminded the Cabinet that the objections to the proposed development included its scale, and environmental and infrastructure issues, as detailed in the evidence paper. Principal concerns related to the potential impact on highways and the transport infrastructure and Councillor Nash suggested that the Cabinet should take account of those issues at the earliest possible stage. Councillor Nash further suggested that a 'round table' meeting should take place with representative groups of residents in an attempt to ameliorate concerns and to help in the preparation of consultation responses. Councillor Nash expressed further concern over the potential traffic impact on the ring road and an increased demand for parking. Whilst appreciating that any funding in respect of parking facilities would be dependant on developer contributions, Councillor Nash stated that he would be happier if there was a suggestion in the draft document that this would happen.

Councillor JA Harris commented that there was clear public opposition to the proposed development and expressed the view that it should be reconsidered.

In response, the Deputy Leader stated that he shared some of the concerns expressed by Councillor Nash. He had already been in contact with various representative groups and would invite them to assist in drawing up the development master plan.

It was reported that traffic modelling work had been commissioned, and was on-going. The concerns raised in responses to the Preferred Development Strategy would need to be addressed in order to ensure the proper mitigation of any adverse impact. In addition, the impact on parking of the proposed development would also need to be addressed.

A Member commented that the Planning Inspector for the last Local Plan had concluded that, in principle, this was an acceptable site for development. The Member considered that the proposed master plan to be critical in order to achieve a cohesive development, including the integration of green spaces and sports facilities. The Member further considered landscaping and tree planting to be of vital importance and concluded by expressing support for the suggestion that representative groups be involved in drawing up the master plan.

(ii) Andoversford

Councillor RL Hughes reported that the Parish Council was concerned over issues relating to flooding and access to one of the proposed sites. Councillor Hughes also stated that the Parish Council was in the process of identifying some alternative sites.

In response, Officers outlined the process by which sites had been assessed and identified, including community engagement and participation by the relevant Town/Parish Council. It was reported that Officers had sought to meet the wishes of communities and that the two potential sites in Andoversford shown on the plan on page 44 of Appendix 'A' to the circulated report had been identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The Parish Council had expressed the view that those sites were not suitable for development and, following an investigation of flooding issues on the sites, including with the Environment Agency, it had been concluded that the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment at the planning application stage would be acceptable. It was reiterated that account had been taken of the views expressed but that, in planning terms, those sites could come forward and their suitability was supported by the evidence base. It was further reported that Officers would welcome the submission of other potential sites but it was noted that the draft document could only include those sites Officers had been aware of at that stage in the process.

Note:

Councillor Lynden Stowe had declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in this item and left the Meeting while it was being discussed. Councillor NJW Parsons took the Chair in his absence.

(iii) Blockley

Councillor BS Dare stated that he had not been elected to 'spread concrete across the north Cotswolds' and that he had zero enthusiasm for development of the sites identified in Blockley. Councillor Dare concluded his comments by referring to the volume of submissions raising objections to proposals for large-scale developments in Blockley.

A Member expressed concern over the scale of development being suggested for the village and expressed the view that smaller developments, comprising between ten and fifteen dwellings, might be more acceptable in this location. The Leader reminded the Cabinet that the Blockley allotments site (BK11) was currently a 'reserve' site.

(iv) Bourton-on-the-Water

No comments were made in relation to the two sites proposed at Bourton-on-the-Water.

(v) Chipping Campden

The Leader stated that he was aware that the sites proposed at Chipping Campden were not supported by the Town Council, which was discussing how the evidence could be challenged during the consultation period.

(vi) Down Ampney

Councillor David Fowles reminded the Cabinet that 252 new homes were proposed for development in Down Ampney, and that the size of the settlement had increased by 38% since 2000 with sixty new dwellings having been built across three sites during the past ten-twelve years. Councillor Fowles stated that Down Ampney prided itself on its characteristics which, he contended, should be preserved. Councillor Fowles referred to the two Design Statements for the village, and explained that the 2008 consultation on the Parish Plan, which had identified three sites as being suitable for development, had achieved a 91% response rate. Councillor Fowles stated that another village in close proximity to Down Ampney, which could deliver twenty new dwellings, had not been included on the list of seventeen settlements identified in Appendix 'A' to the circulated report.

Councillor Fowles amplified aspects of the three identified sites and contended that site DA\_2 should remain as an open space. Councillor Fowles expressed support for the inclusion of site DA\_5 as a potential site and concluded by reiterating his view that site DA\_2 should be excluded.

In response, the Deputy Leader suggested that Councillor Fowles should submit his representations through the consultation process.

(vii) Fairford

In response to a question from the Leader, it was reported that the Cabinet was being requested to consider only preferred sites for inclusion in the draft document. Reserve sites could not be included as there was currently insufficient certainty that they would be deliverable. A number of recent planning applications relating to sites in Fairford had already been determined and had more than met the requirement for new dwellings, and a statement to that effect would be included in the draft document.

(viii) Kemble

Councillor JGK Birch reminded the Cabinet that Kemble was the only connection to the rail link between the south Cotswolds and London, and referred to the problems with car parking that were currently being experienced at Kemble Station. Councillor Birch suggested that reference to alternative parking provision at the station should have been included in the draft document.

In response, it was reported that the issue could be addressed in the forthcoming parking study or the Local Transport Plan. A Member commented

that it might be appropriate to use some Section 106 Agreement money from the proposed Chesterton development to address this issue as it was probable that that development would have an impact on car parking at the station.

(ix) Lechlade

Councillor Sue Coakley commented that the local community had engaged in the previous review of the SHLAA and was supportive of the proposed allocations for Lechlade. Councillor Coakley referred to an additional site which had come forward recently and explained that the landowner hoped it could be included.

A Member commented that the additional site referred to could address the shortfall in Lechlade compared with the number that had been identified in the Preferred Development Strategy in 2013. In response, the Forward Planning Officer advised that there was no shortfall in Lechlade.

(x) Mickleton

The Leader commented that a reserve site had been identified in Mickleton and had been referred to on page 123 of the Appendices to Appendix 'D'. In response, the Cabinet was reminded that reserve sites could not be included in the draft document as there was insufficient certainty that such sites would be deliverable.

(xi) Moreton-in-Marsh

Councillor RW Dutton commented that he supported the proposal for an enterprise zone at the Fire Services College which could provide employment for some of the occupiers of the new dwellings recently approved for the town. Councillor Dutton reminded the Cabinet that recent planning permissions could result in a 40% increase in the population and that those would not result in any improvements to the town's infrastructure. Councillor Dutton explained that the old hospital site was scheduled for development during the next year and commented that the town needed time to cope with the expansion approved to date before any further developments were considered.

A Member considered that the issue of traffic problems over the Listed railway bridge should be emphasised in the draft document. In response, the Leader stated that the Council had limited ability to address that issue. In response to a comment from the Leader, it was reported that the draft document was seeking comments on proposed allocations, rather than on developments which had already been approved. It was queried whether other local authorities had included such sites in their draft documents, in addition to sites proposed for development. The Leader requested Officers to consider whether that issue could be addressed by investigating if other authorities had shown sites in Local Plans that had already been granted planning permission.

(xii) Northleach

No comments were made in relation to the three sites proposed at Northleach.



(xiii) Siddington

It was reported that Siddington had not been included in the draft document because there were no sites which were considered to be suitable for allocation and because there had only been two dwellings built, or with extant planning permission, since 2011.

Councillor Ms JM Layton asked why the North Hill Road site had not been included and when consideration would be given to reserve sites. In response, it was reported that the Development Strategy had set out clearly what constituted a settlement. In functional terms, the North Hill Road site was part of the built-up area of Cirencester, rather than Siddington, so it had been included in the Cirencester section of the draft document. In response to the question on reserve sites, the Cabinet was reminded of the Officer view that there was no justification to include those sites given the current requirement for new dwellings as there was no certainty that such sites would come forward and they could not be relied on as being deliverable sites in the Development Strategy. However, some such sites could well come forward as 'windfall' sites.

The Leader expressed concern that the reserve sites were not being included for consultation and asked how other local authorities had dealt with this issue. In response, it was reported that, in the opinion of Officers, the Council had exceeded what many other local authorities had done in respect of public engagement and had drawn up its list of preferred sites based on robust evidence. The current view was that the Council had identified deliverable sites which could meet current housing needs and that the inclusion of reserve sites at this stage could set the Local Plan process back by up to a year. It was also reported that the Council had consulted specific Parishes as part of the engagement exercise and that this was evidence that there had been consultation on reserve sites.

(xiv) South Cerney

No comments were made in relation to the tow sites proposed at South Cerney.

(xv) Stow-on-the-Wold

No comments were made in relation to the two sites proposed at Stow-on-the-Wold.

(xvi) Tetbury

No comments were made in relation to the three sites proposed at Tetbury, although it was noted that the allocation for the town, proposed in the Preferred Development Strategy, had already been met.

(xvii) Upper Rissington

No allocation had been suggested in relation to Upper Rissington as its housing needs had already been met by panning permissions which had resulted in almost a 100% increase.

(xviii) Willersey

Councillor Mrs. SL Jepson stated that the Parish Council had already considered the three sites identified at Willersey and would be submitting its comments thereon. Councillor Mrs. Jepson expressed concern over the volume of development being proposed for a small, rural village with few amenities.

Note:

Councillor Lynden Stowe had declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in this item and left the Meeting while it was being discussed. Councillor NJW Parsons took the Chair in his absence.

Rural Housing

The Cabinet welcomed the submission of the Rural Housing paper which, it was considered, would enable development in some villages through a community-led process. It was also considered that the paper was proof that the Council had taken note of consultation responses.

In relation to recommendation (b) in the circulated report, the Deputy Leader explained that:-

- (i) the final version of the SHLAA Panel's deliberations on Gypsy and travellers' sites had been included at Appendix 'G' to the circulated report. Plans, text and policies would be produced, based on the outcomes of that evidence, which would be aimed at meeting the District's requirements, as established by the Gloucestershire County Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (October 2013);
- (ii) requisite evidence justifying the draft green space proposals was expected to be completed in time for it to be included as part of the forthcoming formal consultation;
- (iii) explanatory text and specific policies would be included for each of the seventeen settlements identified at Appendix 'A' to the circulated report. It was unlikely that they would be controversial as the Cabinet was being requested to approve the proposed housing and employment site allocations detailed on the plans at Appendix 'A' to the circulated report at this Meeting;
- (iv) confirmation of housing numbers was required in light of the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs evidence. The current figure was 7,500 but that figure could be revisited in the light of further consideration of the evidence and if it proved necessary to do so;
- (v) any minor typographical and/or factual errors picked up by Members or Officers, would be corrected.

The Leader reminded the Cabinet that the suggestion relating to assistance from representative groups in drawing up the master plan for the proposed Chesterton development had already been addressed by the Deputy Leader. The Leader also reminded the Cabinet that, as the formal consultation process

was due to commence on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> January 2015, there would effectively be a twelve-week consultation period as the documents were already in the public domain. Reference to the consultation would be included in the next edition of 'Cotswold News' and members of the public who had attended this Meeting could receive a CD containing a copy of the relevant documents, on request. The Leader concluded by reiterating that representations could be submitted through the Council's Web Site.

In response to a further question from Councillor Ms Layton, the Deputy Leader reported that, as no specific allocations or developments had been proposed in respect of the Water Park, specific policies relating to the Water Park were not required at this stage. However, there would be a future opportunity for any specific management policies to be produced, if necessary.

The Deputy Leader also explained that Officers had produced a list detailing, as far as was practicable, ownerships of the various sites identified to ensure that Members could declare any interests, as appropriate.

**RESOLVED that:**

- (a) the Consultation Document attached at Appendix 'A' to the circulated report be approved;**
- (b) the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning be authorised to approve the outstanding matters, including minor amendments to the Consultation Document, prior to the start of the public consultation period;**
- (c) the Consultation Document, including any amendments made by the Cabinet, and any minor amendments and/or updates, be made available for public comment, together with the 'Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report to accompany the Local Plan Reg. 18 Consultation: Development Strategy and Site Allocations' and Habitat Regulations Assessment, for a period of six weeks, commencing on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2015.**

**Record of Voting - for 6, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

CAB.74

**FIVE-YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY - UPDATE**

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning introduced this item.

Further to Minute CAB.120(2) of 1<sup>st</sup> May 2014, the Cabinet was requested to consider the latest five-year housing land supply position for the District. The Cabinet was reminded of the background to the requirement for the Council to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and a 20% 'buffer'. It was reported that a recent decision by a Planning Inspector in relation to an appeal against a refusal of planning permission on land south of Cirencester Road, Fairford (application 13/03097/OUT) had established that the Council did not have an Objectively-Assessed Housing Need (OAN) and could not rely on the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) figure to calculate its five-year housing land supply figure. Subsequent to that appeal decision, the Council had commissioned a study with Forest of Dean and Stroud District Councils, which had established an OAN of 7,500 over the period of the Local Plan, or 375

dwellings per year. The five-year housing land supply document had been amended to reflect this, and to remove reference to the RSS.

Consequently, the Cabinet considered that the Council could now demonstrate a 6.6 year housing land supply, incorporating the 20% 'buffer'.

**RESOLVED that the latest five-year housing land supply position, attached at Appendix 'A' to the circulated report, be endorsed as a material consideration when determining planning applications for residential development.**

**Record of Voting - for 6, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

CAB.75

**NOTICE OF MOTION - COLLECTION OF RESIDUAL AND RECYCLABLE WASTE FROM PRIMARY SCHOOLS**

The Cabinet was requested to consider the following Motion, referred by the Council from its Meeting on 13<sup>TH</sup> May 2014, relating to the collection of residual and recyclable waste from primary schools. The Motion had been Proposed by Councillor PR Hodgkinson and Seconded by Councillor DJ Nash:-

*'This Council notes the savings which the waste company, Ubico Ltd. will be making over the next five years of £5m.*

*It therefore commits to ask Ubico to use a very small part of those savings to collect residual and recyclable waste from all Cotswold District primary schools as part of the domestic waste collections.*

*This will save those schools an average of £5,000 over five years in the waste collection costs they currently have to pay to private rubbish companies - money which can instead go directly to children's education.'*

In accordance with the Council's procedures and custom and practice, Councillors PR Hodgkinson and DJ Nash had been invited to attend the Meeting to present and speak to their Motion.

Councillor Hodgkinson was invited to address the Cabinet and speak to the Motion. He explained the rationale behind the Motion, which was to offer a cash life-line to primary schools in the District by including them in the Council's domestic refuse collection arrangements, which would enable the schools to divert the money currently spent on refuse collection towards children's educations and reduce the number of vehicle journeys. Councillor Hodgkinson contended that it did would make financial and environmental sense for the Council's refuse vehicles to collect refuse from the primary schools which they passed en route to making domestic refuse collections. Councillor Hodgkinson stated that he had contacted the forty-four primary schools in the District and approximately half of those schools had expressed support for the campaign. Councillor Hodgkinson referred to the suggested way forward, as detailed at paragraph 5 of the circulated report and concluded by suggesting that the Cabinet should address the issue straightaway, rather than waiting until the current contracts for school waste collections to expire in September 2016.

Councillor Nash was invited to address the Cabinet to formally Seconded the Motion and to speak to it. Councillor Nash suggested that this could be an

opportunity for Gloucestershire County Council to set-up a unified County-wide system, which would save money for primary schools and Council Tax payers.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Communities reminded the Cabinet that the schools were committed to their current waste collection contracts, which were due to expire in September 2016. The Cabinet Member apprised the Cabinet of work, prompted by the Motion, which had already commenced in respect of proposals for a new scheme following expiry of the existing contracts. The Cabinet Member concluded by explaining that the last issue to be addressed was if the Council would be able to treat waste from the primary schools as 'household' waste.

The Cabinet considered that the Motion could reduce the number of vehicle movements and that the way forward should be endorsed, as detailed in the circulated report.

Councillor Hodgkinson was invited to make some further comments and he suggested that the Cabinet Member for Environment and Communities should seek to either change the existing contracts or to influence them as part of her Cabinet role.

In response, the Cabinet Member reminded the Cabinet that, as the contracts were between Gloucestershire County Council and the primary schools, Councillor Hodgkinson would be in a stronger position than her to change the contracts as he was also a County Councillor. The Cabinet Member concluded by stating that she was seeking to exert influence through negotiations with the Joint Waste Partnership.

**RESOLVED that:**

- (a) the Motion be noted;**
- (b) the actions taken to date be noted, and the proposed way forward as detailed in the circulated report, be endorsed.**

**Record of Voting , for 6, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

CAB.76

**NOTICE OF MOTION - COLLECTION OF TETRA PACKS AT KERBSIDE**

The Cabinet was requested to consider the following Motion, referred by the Council from its Meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2014, relating to the collection of tetra packs at the kerbside. The Motion had been Proposed by Councillor PR Hodgkinson and Seconded by Councillor Ms JM Layton:-

*'This Council notes the recent missed targets for recycling. At present, tetra packs can't be recycled on the kerbside. As a way of boosting recycling rates across the District, and to help the environment, it calls for tetra packs to be recycled on the kerbside as soon as possible.'*

In accordance with the Council's procedures and custom and practice, Councillors PR Hodgkinson and Ms JM Layton had been invited to attend the Meeting to present and speak to their Motion.

Councillor Hodgkinson was invited to address the Cabinet and speak to the Motion. He explained the rationale behind the Motion, which was to increase

recycling rates across the District following a recent fall and some missed targets. Councillor Hodgkinson stated that other Councils, including West Oxfordshire District Council, collected tetra packs from the kerbside and that there was public support for such an initiative in the Cotswold District. Councillor Hodgkinson referred to the joint working arrangements between this Council and West Oxfordshire District Council and asked why, if the Councils shared staff, they did not also share examples of good practice. Councillor Hodgkinson explained that many tetra packs ended up in landfill. He referred to the Council's previous decision to introduce the kerbside collection of plastics for recycling and suggested that this be taken a step further to include the collection of tetra packs, reminding the Cabinet that they could not be recycled with cardboard due to contamination issues. Councillor Hodgkinson also referred to the cost of the Local Plan process and contended that the Council could find the necessary funding for this initiative, and concluded by urging the Cabinet to support the Motion.

Councillor Ms Layton was invited to address the Cabinet to formally Seconded the Motion and to speak to it. Councillor Ms Layton reminded the Cabinet that the original five 'bring sites' had been reduced to three, which were located in Cirencester, Stow-on-the-Wold and South Cerney. Councillor Ms Layton contended that, as many people were not prepared to travel to recycle their tetra packs, the majority of such packs ended up in landfill sites. Councillor Ms Layton referred to the recent 'gRRReen' and 'reduce, recycle and reuse' initiatives and stated that some residents in South Cerney would welcome the removal of that 'bring site' because of the noise and litter it created. Councillor Ms Layton considered it important for the Council to introduce a kerbside collection of tetra packs and suggested that a further household container would not be required. Councillor Ms Layton concluded by urging the Cabinet to consider the issues raised.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Communities thanked the Proposer and Seconder for the Motion, explaining that it assumed the kerbside collection of tetra packs would result in a boost in recycling rates. The Cabinet Member contended that such an assumption was not borne out by the figures, explaining that, if even thirty-five tonnes of cartons were collected from the kerbside, recycling performance would only be increased by 0.1%. The Cabinet Member explained that Officers had considered the issue and had concluded that the Council should not introduce the kerbside collection of tetra packs until a new depot site had been secured, as a future business case for a permanent depot might enable the Council to consider the bulking of plastics, cans and cartons. The Cabinet Member was aware of the limitations on the current 'bring site' service, but explained that a new contract had recently been let to a contractor with more compacting capacity. As a result, the Council was now able to consider a short-term increase in the number of 'bring sites'.

The Cabinet considered the kerbside collection of tetra packs to be an expensive option currently as it could cost up to £100,000 to achieve a 0.1% increase in recycling rates. It was suggested that the use of tetra packs was likely to reduce in the near future in favour of plastic bottles, which were already collected from the kerbside, and that the business case for the kerbside collection of tetra packs should be considered when the Council would be able to consider bulking of recyclates within its own resources.

Councillor Hodgkinson was invited to make some further comments and he expressed the view that a lot of people used products which were sold in tetra

packs, which were widely recycled. Councillor Hodgkinson contended that the Cabinet would be missing a 'green' opportunity if it did not support the introduction of kerbside collections of tetra pack and he commented that other local authorities offered a better service to their Council Tax payers. Councillor Hodgkinson suggested that there should be a dialogue between this Council and West Oxfordshire District Council over various initiatives that the Council had introduced but this Council had not. Councillor Hodgkinson concluded by stating that this Council would eventually introduce the kerbside collection of tetra packs.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Communities reminded the Cabinet that there was already a two-way flow of information and ideas between this Council and West Oxfordshire District Council. The Cabinet Member pointed out that this Council recycled items such as aerosols that other Councils did not. The Cabinet Member concluded by suggesting that the issue of the kerbside collection of tetra packs be looked at again in the future.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(a) the Motion be noted;**

**(b) in light of the business case, costs and limited impact the collection of cartons will have on recycling performance, no further action be taken, pending a future business case on depot development.**

**Record of Voting - for 6, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

The Meeting commenced at 4.05 p.m. and closed at 6.30 p.m.

Chairman

(END)